DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 508 JC 790 521

AUTHOR Vernon, Christie D.
TITLE Elected/Selected Division Chairmen: A Survey of Two-Year College Administrator Opinion.
INSTITUTION Thomas Nelson Community Coll., Hampton, Va.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel: Administrative Problems; *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Selection; *College Faculty: Community Colleges; *Department Directors (School): Elections; *Junior Colleges: National Surveys

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to determine current practices in selecting/electing division chairmen at community colleges nationwide. An inquiry was sent to 58 colleges asking how division/department chairpersons were chosen, to whom they were accountable, term length, the advantages and disadvantages of the system in use, and which system (election or appointment) was preferable and why. The survey revealed that elective procedures were used by 11 of the 48 colleges that responded and that the elected chairpersons were ususally accountable to the academic dean; 33 colleges used selective procedures (appointment by the administration was the most common mode) and the selected chairpersons were almost always accountable to the chief administrative officer. The chief advantage of the appointment process was that "appointed chairpersons are truly representatives of the administration." The chief disadvantage was felt to be a loss of faculty identity. The respondents felt there was little advantage to the elective process. The advantages they noted included: the faculty was better represented and had a part in determining their leadership, that the process can involve all school segments, and that morale is higher. Some disadvantages that were cited related to role confusion and problems of loyality and impartiality in evaluation. Of the respondents, 41 favored a system of administrative appointment. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180508

ELECTED SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN:

A SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR OPINION

Christie D. Vernon, Ed.D.

Coordinator of Library Services
Thomas Nelson Community College

Hampton, Virginia

May, 1979

JC 790 521

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christie D. Vernon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN:

A SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR OPINION

I. Introduction: Statement of the Problem.

The question which interested us was this: how did the selection process for Division Chairmen affect their role?

...Might the choice of selection process determine what tasks were believed to be appropriate for the Chairman?
...Might the selection process affect their ability to be effective at certain traditional tasks?
...Might faculty and administrative differences as to the best selection process reflect the views of each group as to which selection process would ensure attitudes and behaviors (by Chairment) that would advance their own goals and interests?

It is easy for each of us to formulate common sense answers to these questions, but common sense does not always inform our opinions. At my college, the faculty association had put forward a proposal that the selection and term for Division Chairmen be changed. A considerable amount of heated discussion ensued. There was much loose talk to the effect that "nobody does that..." and "everybody does this..."

The first information needed was a determination of the current practice in representative two-year colleges in the country. The second information needed was the attitude of the chief academic officers as to the functionality/dysfunctionality of the process used in their colleges.

II. Methodology.

A letter of inquiry incorporating a very short form was sent to the 'Chief Academic Officer' at 58 two-year colleges which met the following criteria:

...publicly controlled, coeducational, two-year colleges;
...offering both transfer and occupational-technical curricula; and
...accredited by tehir regional associations.

In addition, they:

...had enrollment between 3,000 and 7,000 (headcount);
...were single-campus entities containing a mix of full and part-time students similar to Thomas Nelson; and
...were as representative geographically as possible.

The questions were:

How are your Division/Department Chairment chosen?
To whom are they accountable?
What is their term?
What are the advantages of your system? the disadvantages?
What is the preferable system (in your opinion) and why?

The form had very short spaces, so that answers had to be concise, which may account for the fact that 48 of the 58 inquiries were answered. (A tabulation of the verbatim responses is attached.) Some respondents wrote letters, and many attached job descriptions or contract provisions for their Division Chairmen. All this produced a notebook full of interesting and worthwhile information which deserves analysis.

At this time, we will address only the selection process, and their characteristics, as seen by ief academic officers. Task/responsibilities are mentioned only as they are affected by the process.

Obviously, views of faculty members were not a part of this study, and can be discussed only by inference. (This survey should be the next step.)

III. Definition of terms:

The terminology of academic administration is far from standardized: one college may have a 'Director" in charge of all operations, while another has a 'Vice-President' supervising five people. For this study will will use the following definitions:

First line academic administrator: In charge of all instructional activities.
Titles: Dean of Instruction; Vice-President for Instruction (or Academic Affairs); Dean of Credit Programs; Dean.

Second line academic administrator: In charge of a sub-cluster of instructional activities: Humanities, etc.
Titles: Division Chairmen; Division Directors; Area Deans; Associate Deans; Deans.

Third line academic administrator: In charge of disciplines or programs within the clusters: English, etc.
Titles: Program Heads; Department Chairmen.

Our concern is with the critical interface person between the administration and faculty (most typically the second line administrator), who must deal with budget, staffing, evaluation and promotion, faculty and instructional development, and the initiation of change. We will define this person as the second line academic administrator and call him/her the Division Chairman.

IV. Findings

A. We found the following procedures in use:

Elective procedures are used by 11 of the 48 colleges, and include:

...nomination by the discipline, and appointment by 'Academic Affairs;'
...nomination by the division, and appointment by the Trustees;
...nomination (recommendation) by the department, and appointment by the President;
...election, with ratification by the administration;
...selection by the administration, with vote of affirmation by the faculty;
...simple election.

The elected Chairmen are usually accountable to the Academic Dean, but may also be accountable to the union or to the President.

Selective procedures are used by 33 colleges, for example:

...appointments by the 'administration', is the most common mode, and may include the Dean of Instruction, the Academic Vice-President, or the President upon the recommendation of the chief academic officer.

...in many cases, even the department chairmen (3rd line administrators) are appointed and are accountable to Area Deans or Associate Deans (the second line administrators)

Appointed Division Chairmen are almost universally accountable to the chief academic officer.

Other situations were covered by 4 unique responses:

..."the situation has been unresolved for years;"
...election and selection are both used;
..."we are going to try a lead-instructor system" (whatever this is);
..."no Division Chairmen because of Proposition 13 and collective bargaining problems."

B. The advantages and disadvantages of the appointive process:

The views on the advantages of appointing Division Chairmen can be summed up in one response: "They are truly representative of the administration."

This 'true representation' is embodied in the characteristics of selected chairmen.

...They are loyal, supportive of existing policies, understand the system, work well in a line-staff organization, and have no role confusion.

...They are considered to be the best qualified people, chosen for their organizing skills and ability to 'work best in the overall college picture. The administrator selects 'the person he can work with.'

...They are full-time, permanent (as long as performance is satisfactory), have the continuity needed for learning the job, doing planning, and can assume a wide variety of administrative responsibilities.

...They are clearly accountable to the administration for their performance and the performance of their unit and can be replaced if unsatisfactory.

...They are able to function in faculty evaluation (salary, promotion, discipline, tenure) matters, and to develop skil at choosing new staff.

...They are in close touch with faculty over time, provide communication between faculty and the chief academic officer.

...They may develop team spirit in their unit, and among themselves as they work cooperatively on common problems.

...Selection results in less of a popularity contest; the chairman has the power to do difficult but necessary things. (Not one single administrator mentioned that an appointed Chairman had to remain 'popular' with the Dean.)

This substantial list is somewhat counter-balanced by a few disadvantages,

as the administrators see it:

...The lines between faculty and administration are too definitely drawn. They are considered administration by faculty, and may be imposed and not the faculty's preference.

...Their roles, though clear, are difficult and may become adversary; they are torn between faculty and administration.

...They are less accountable to faculty, and their interests, which poses problems when changes are necessary.

...They may stop teaching, lose their faculty identity, and faculty come to feel they are not well represented.

...There may be difficulty in locating persons with administrative ability. Those who come from the faculty are not trained, may not take the transition well, and may be weak in evaluation of personnel. (A universal complaint, regardless of process.)

C. The advantages and disadvantages of the elective process:

The respondents find little advantage to the elective process. In fact,

in the designated space, one wrote "FEW!" However, several were identified:

...Faculty are better represented and have a part in deciding who their leaders will be;

...The process can involve all segments: faculty administration, and Board;

...Elected chairment support faculty and have better rapport with them;

...Morale is higher.

The disadvantages of the elective process were numerous and can be grouped into categories:

...There is role confusion; Chairmen feel 'marginal' being clearly neither

nor administration, they may not see responsibilities clearly.

...There is a problem of loyalty; allegiance is not with the administrative team.

...Evaluation is difficult to perform honestly, since it would impair reelection possibilities.

...There is a lack of direct accountability to the administration; this may be complicated by collective bargaining agreements.

...There is no assurance that a skilled person will be elected; the term must be long enough to ensure training. There may be a short supply of qualified people.

...Political aspects interfere with performance: people are elected as 'compromises,' to block another person, or for other reasons not related to competence. Mid-way through the term they are weakened by becoming lame ducks. In some systems, they may be recalled by faculty, and thus have no independence or authority.

Some amusing advice was proffered from Illinois: we should "read George Washington's letters about the election of Officers in the Colonial Militia during the American Revolution." We will refer back to this advice in the Summary, when we discuss the central problem, which is the philosophy of authority.

D. The process which the administrators responding favor:

Of the 48 respondents, 41 came down firmly for a system of administrative selection and appointment. Four support the election process, if the period of service is long enough for training, or if it is at the department chairman (third line) level. One particularly strong statement was made in favor of election: that it "provides a check against arbitrary or faulty judgment." The reasons for their choice can be summarized:

> It is necessary for the instructional program to be managed and administered, and that it is in the best interest of the institution for management to have influence at this level. It is desired that the Division Chairman be the right arm of the Dean (Vice-President), be loyal to him, be accountable to him, be a person of high capabilities, have a team spirit about leadership in the institution, and be able to show initiative and create change when necessary.

Surely Deans must fantasize about Division Chairmen like that!

V. THE CRITICAL ISSUES OF THE ELECTION/SELECTION DEBATE:

The nature of the critical issue of the election/selection debate was well expressed by a respondent from Florida, who said: "The faculty favors little or no authority, administrative responsibility or accountability below the level of Dean. The administration favors accountable management at the discipline level." Clearly, there is at least a dynamic tension between those views, if not a no-man's-land.

The move toward administrative appointment and control, largely a foregone conclusion for Division Chairmen at most colleges, is in some cases being extended toward the department (discipline) level, particularly in larger colleges. The question is being affected, and determined, by the contract provisions in collective bargaining which determine in which unit the department chairmen shall be.

The movement toward administrative control and accountability, and away from the ideas of autonomy, professionalism, and collegiality seems to arise from the psyche of the seventies. In March, 1970, Richardson described a theory of authority, which he called the 'punch bowl theory.'

> "...(the belief) that any action which delegates a role in the decision-making process to individuals or groups not presently involved diminishes the amount of authority available to those who currently carry out administrative function. Of course, if you ladle out enough authority, the bowl will be completely empty."
>
> ...More formally, this says that authority represents "the power vested in the governing body by legislative act...which, in turn flows through the president to the officers or agents whom he designates. In turn, this flow of authority enables the officers of the college to issue directives which guide the activities of the institution."

Richardson believed this was a simplistic theory which stood as a stumbling block to increased involvement of all segments of the academic community in the decision-making process. He believed it resembled the strongly hierarchical military and industrial organizations, and gives us a false sense of 'control' which is not realistic. He maintained that authority actually depends upon the

assent of those governed, that their resistance can bring an enterprise to a halt - if not unseat presidents - and that colleges should accept the hypothesis that authority is delegated upward rather than handed down. (At this point we refer back to Geo. Washington's militia letters and point out that while some people think that college goals and organization should resemble those of the military, others do not.)

Richardson also stated that a "two-year college with respect to its educational program (including all services rendered by the professional staff) requires only a minimum level of coordination." (p. 19) He believed that an organization which wishes to maximize the free flow of communication and the solving of problems, will reduce its hierarchical differentiation and coordination.

Richardson wrote on the threshold between the 60's and 70's and his views may be more conservative now. In any event, we are clearly in an era when 'management' is extolled and control and accountability are believed to be important.

Pressures on (from) administrators

Administrators now feel pressures typical of this decade: accountability for use of resources, teacher performance, and student competency; consumerism; the view that the owners of the college are the public, acting through legislatures, boards, and presidents; demands for faculty productivity schedules and incredible amounts of numerical justifications for everything. They are under scrutiny, if not attack, by bureaucracies that rise 3 to 4 levels above themselves.

Pressures on (from) faculty

Faculty, on the other hand, often see no merit in all this activity, and no real improvement in the teaching-learning process. There is too much management; too much making the simple complex; too much paperwork - and too little learning and professional activity. The faculty ethic is based on the idea that their work is autonomous, private, and creative. They resist interference, especially by non-teachers. To protect their work space, they set up formal and informal means to maintain control of their physical areas, their resources, and the design of their work ideas and practices. They resist attempts to make them change teaching styles, to be observed and evaluated, and to be increasingly over managed and bureaucratized.

Increasingly, the relationships between faculty and administration become adversarial, and collective bargaining steps in to formalize the confrontation.

It is a sobering prospect, and reflects a monumental shift in our philosophy of collegial governance, regardless of the lip service we pay to 'participatory management.' The capturing of the colleges by larger bureaucracies, and their loss of autonomy, appear to be at the root of the problem.

As we return to our original questions, we find some definite answers:

...The beliefs about what tasks are appropriate for Division Chairmen has a profound effect on the choice of a selection process;

...Administrators view the selection process as critical in the ability of the Division Chairmen to be effective at traditional tasks: planning, personnel matters (evaluation, promotion, etc.), and the initiation of change - which includes staff development and instructional development.

...The administrative view that appointment is the best process because of the loyalty, accountability, and administrative team spirit that result, reflects the need of the first line administrator to control so that he can be accountable at levels above himself.

...The faculty's needs for 'higher morale', 'protection against arbitrary or faulty judgment,' and a sense that their interests are represented becomes lost among the bureaucratic imperatives.

Nobody knows - and honest people will differ - whether the managerial era in college governance will have a noticeably beneficial effect on the students or the public. It is just another way of doing things. Probably, as we are in the process of clarifying its elements, it is in the process of change.

DIVISION CHAIRPERSONS - SELECTED ARTICLES

Berrier, G.G. "Department Chairman: What Does He Do?" Clearing House, March 1974, pp. 432-36.

Blomerley, Peter. "The Junior College Department and Academic Governance." Junior College Journal, February 1971, pp. 38-40.

Booth, D.B. "Institutional and Disciplinary Ideas for Development." Educational Record, Winter 1977, pp. 83-90.

Boyer, W.W. "Role of Department Chairmen in Collective Bargaining: The University of Delaware Experience." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, April 1974, pp. 49-54.

* Braunstein, D.N. and Benston, G.J. "Student and Department Chairman Views of the Performance of University Professors." Journal of Applied Psychology, October 1973, pp. 244-49.

* Buckles, S. "So You Want to be a Department Chairman." Journal of Economic Education, Spring 1978, pp. 119-22.

* Buhl, L.C. and Greenfield, A. "Contracting for Professional Development in Academe." Educational Record, Spring 1975, pp. 111-21.

Byrnes, J.F. "Resolution of the Department Chairman Issue Through Collective Bargaining." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, Fall 1977, pp. 34-38.

Carroll, A.B. "Role Conflict in Academic Organizations: An Exploratory Examination of the Department Chairman's Experience." Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring 1974, pp. 51-64.

* Carroll, A.B. "Role Conflict Phenomenon: Implications for Department Chairmen and Academic Faculty." Improving College and University Teaching, Autumn 1976, pp. 245-46.

"The Effects of Short Term Interventions on a Community College Division Chairperson." ERIC ED 138 321.

* Ehrle, E.B. and Earley, J.F. "Effect of Collective Bargaining on Department Chairpersons and Deans." Educational Record 57, No. 3 (1976), pp. 149-54.

* Ehrle, E.B. "Selection and Evaluation of Department Chairmen." Educational Record, Winter 1975, pp. 29-38.

Groner, N.E. "Leadership Situations in Academic Departments: Relations Among Measures of Situational Favorableness and Control." Research in Higher Education, April 1978, pp. 125-43.

Hall, J.C. and Thomas, J.B. "Role Specification for Applicants for Heads of Mathematics Departments in Schools." Educational Review, February 1978, pp. 35-39.

* May be found in the TNCC collection

"How to Make Better Use of Department Chairmen." ERIC ED 136 366.

Ingari, S. "Turnabout: A Department Evaluates Its Supervisor." NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, pp. 70-73.

Ingram, A. "Administrators of Combined Departments are Needed Who Desire the Welfare of All." Physical Educator, October 1977, pp. 135-38.

* Koehnline, W.A. and Blocker, C.E. "Division Chairmen in the Community College." Junior College Journal, February 1970, pp. 9-12.

Littrell, J.H. "Research-based Technique for Selecting Chairpersons." NASSP Bulletin, April 1978, pp. 24-28.

"The Management of College Departments - Change and Development. Coombe Lodge Report, Study Conference 74/4." ERIC ED 146 838.

McClanahan, S.F. "Upmanship for the Aspiring Department Chairman." Contemporary Education, Summer 1977, pp. 232-33.

* Mobley, T.A. "Selecting the Department Chairman." Educational Record, Fall 1971, pp. 321-27.

* O'Grady, J., Jr. "Departmental Chairmen; Study of Missouri and Illinois Two Year Colleges." Improving College and University Teaching, Autumn 1973, pp. 270-72. Junior College Journal, February 1971, pp. 32-34+.

Penman, K.A. and Reeg, J. "Evaluation of Department Chairmen in Physical Education by Subordinates." Physical Educator, March 1976, pp. 18-19.

Richardson, Richard C. "Needed: New Directions in Administration." Junior College Journal, March 1970, pp. 16-22.

Riper, N.E. Van. "Department Heads Who Really Administer." NASSP Bulletin, September 1974, pp. 119-21.

* Roach, J.H.L. "Academic Department Chairperson: Functions and Responsibilities." Educational Record, Winter 1976, pp. 13-23.

Smart, J.C. "Duties Performed by Department Chairmen in Holland's Model Environments." Journal of Educational Psychology, April 1976, pp. 194-204.

* Wilson, R.C. "Leadership Record Examination: An Informal Assessment Scale for Evaluation of Faculty Chairmen." Phi Delta Kappan, May 1977, pp. Back cover +.

* May be found in the TNCC collection

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN: SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (1979)

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: Term	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS; BECAUSE:
Arizona	Dean of Instruction	Dean of Instruct.	Dean of Instruction 1 acad. yr.	Team leaders are selected.	None	Selection by Dean of Instruc. Best interest of institution is maintained. We avoid a popularity contest.
California (I)	Admin. of Sci/Math, Humanities	Dept. Members for each Division	Dean of Instruction 1 year	OLD SYSTEM: No longer have Division/ Chairperson structure.		
		Assoc. Deans	Vice-Pres. for Acad. Affairs.	NEW SYSTEM:		Assoc. Dean organizational structure (for) management and administration of instructional program.
California (II)	Dean of Instruction	NO LONGER USE DIVISION CHAIRS BECAUSE OF PROPOSITION 13 AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROBLEMS.				
Colorado	Vice-Pres. for Instruc.	President, on recommendatinn of Deans and Vice-Pres. for Instruc.	Area Dean Indefinite	Division Directors are defined as administrators.	The lines between faculty and admin. are too definitely drawn as opposed to Dept. Chairman system.	The one that works best with institutions and personalities involved (because) in some cases the Dept. Chrm. system would be better and in other cases, the Div. Director system.
Connecticut	Dean of Acad. Affrs.	Selected by administration.	Dean of Acad. Affrs. Indefinite	Division Directors are supervisors and evaluators of division faculty, learning to 'manage' budget, etc.	None	Selection by Administration. Division Directors must work with the Dean.

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN: SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (1979)

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: Term	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS: BECAUSE:
Florida (I)	Dean for Arts and Sciences	SYSTEM IN FLUX FOR SEVERAL YEARS QUESTIONS TO BE RESOLVED ARE: Acad. Affairs, from discipline selected nominations. (present method)	Dean, A&S. Two years.	1) Method of selection of Chairmen. 2) Administrative responsibilities. 3) Degree of management authority with accountability. 4) Degree of administrative authority residing with the chairman.		FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION DIFFER: Faculty favors: little or no authority, administrative responsibility, or accountability below the level of dean. Administration favors: accountable management at the discipline level.
Florida (II)	Dean of Academic Affairs	Pres., on recomm. by the Dean of Acad. Affairs.	Dean of Acad. Affrs. One calen. year.	Placement of mgmt's first-line representative in daily contact with superiors and teaching faculty at instruction level.	---	Appt. by administration. Range of duties and responsibilities discharges by a chairperson dictates a high degree of selectivity by management (list attchd). Popular selection may not assure appointment of strong administrative person.
Florida (III)	Vice-Pres., Academic	Academic Vice-Pres.	Acad. V-P. One year.	They are administrators.	--	Present system. As administrators/managers they must be an arm of the Vice-President.
Florida (IV)	Dir. of Liberal Arts	Selected by Administration, but vote of affirmation by faculty.	Administration. One year.	Administrator in charge gets to select someone he/she can work with.	Faculty can feel like they had very little say, and Dept. Chairs begin to feel 'marginal' - neither full admin. or faculty.	Keep a combination of both inputs, with either side having a veto power.

16

17

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN: SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (1979)

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: Term	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS : BECAUSE:
Georgia	Dean of Academic Affairs.	Administrative appointment, with input from faculty.	Dean of Academic Affairs. Indefinite.	More accountable to administration; less of a popularity contest; less confusion concerning role and function.	Less accountable to faculty: poses problems when changes are necessary.	Selection based on a joint effort: Chairmen can be accountable to faculty in certain functions and to administration in the performance of other functions.
Idaho	Asst. Acad. Vice-Pres.	Academic Vice-Pres. Approved by Pres.	Academic Vice-Pres. Varied: 4 years or more.	There is a team spirit in each division and among the Division Chairmen who sit as an academic council.	None that we have noted.	The way ours is structured: It works smoothly. The difficult decisions are hammered out then everyone supports them. Faculty are fairly represented.
Illinois (I)	Dean of Instruction.	Administration, with input from a selection committee.	Academic Dean. Until changed.	Administration can select the individual who would work best in the overall college picture.	Considered as administration by faculty.	Appointment by administration: It is not a popularity contest - can carry out duties without worry about being removed by voters. The system of election by peers seems to develop cliques.
Illinois (II)	Vice-Pres. for Acad. Affairs.	Administration.	Dean of Instruction Indefinite; Year-to-year contract.	Administrative committment.	Torn between faculty and administration.	Present system: Management must have influence at this level.
Illinois (III)	Vice-Pres. for Instruc. Services.	Election, with V.P for Instr. Serv. having authority to recommend in lieu of elected person.	Dean. One year.	True faculty representation.	Allegiance is not with administrative team.	Appointment by administration: The administrative function is so important that these positions must give init, & direction to faculty with college goals in mind.

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN: SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (1979)

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: Term	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS: BECAUSE:
Illinois (IV)	Dean, Lib. Arts and Sciences.	1 elected. 4 selected by admin.	Dean Election: 3 years.	PROBLEMS WITH ELECTION: 1) Chairman does not see his administrative responsibilities and duties as clearly; 2) Chairman considers himself a 'lame duck' as soon as he hits the mid-term of his elected term; 3) Faculty politics become extremely important; chairman often elected not for qualifications, but in order to block the election of another person; 4) As faculties become more static, number of people willing able, and capable of serving becomes limited; election requires an endless supply of such people. SUGGESTION: Read George Washington's letters about the election of officers in the Colonial Militia during the American Revolution.		Appointment by Administration: (see left)
Illinois (V)	Vice-Pres. Academic Services	Election: Nom. by Division; accept. by administration; election by Divis.; appointment by Board of Trustees.	V-P. Acad. Services. Two years.	System involves all three segments: faculty, admin.is., and Board.	If faculty member desires to be re-elected, it is difficult for him/her to assume an honest evaluation role.	The present system: It appears to be working for this college.
Illinois (VI)	Executive Vice-Pres.	No Divisional Chairpersons.				Deans of major activities. (Analogous to usual division break-down, plus Community Education.)
Iowa 20	Director of Credit Programs	Administration with colleagial input.	Director. Indefinite.	Continuity; long-range planning; able to function as evaluators; able to assume wide variety of administrative responsibilities.	Get into rut; build up of stereotypes.	Depends upon whether decision making is centralized or decentralized. If a unit has a lot of leeway in making decisions, a stable group of administrators at this level is desirable.
						21

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN: SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (1979)

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: Term.	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS: BECAUSE:
Kansas	Dean of Instruction	Academic Vice-Pres. & recommendation of screening committee	Dean of Instruction. One year renewable contract.	Division Directors are full time administrators.	An added layer in the organizational structure.	Not sure there is an ideal system: A flat system, too cumbersome; a highly structured one, causes communication problems. One system might be "team management."
Kentucky	Academic Dean.	A division search committee which advises the college president (Director)	Academic Dean. Three years.	Limit bureaucracy - direct contact between faculty & executive officer of college.	Small divisions do not have adequate pool of leadership.	Present system: we like it better than other systems: Advantage noted at left.
Massachusetts	Dean of Academic Affairs.	Div. Chairmen are appointed by acad. dean as management position.	Academic Dean. One year - renewable.	Division Chairmen are line managers and are appointed. Dept. Chrm. are governed by collective bargaining agreement.	None, from Dean's point of view.	Appointment (Selection): Essential to appoint Division Chairpersons since under contract administrators are management team members.
Michigan (I)	Dean.	President, upon recommendation of anyone, admin., faculty, staff, community.	Dean. One year.	Good rapport with faculty because they are faculty	Can't be used like administration. They are in the middle, neither fish nor fowl. Don't work 40 hrs. per week.	Selected by administration as administrators - but has not worked with that system.
Michigan (II)	Executive Vice. Pres.	Administration.	Exec. Vice.-President. No limit.	Clear deliniation of administrative roles in a bargaining environment.	--	As stated: if collective bargaining is present or near.

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN: SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (1979)

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: Term	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS: BECAUSE:
Michigan (III) ✓	Dean of Instruction	Elected by the Department; Confirmed by the Board of Trustees.	Various, depending on the issue; sometimes to the adminis. at other times to the union. One year.	Few.	Lack of direct accountability. More a function of union and faculty status than type of selection	To have them as administrators.
New Jersey (I)	Vice. Pres. for Educational Services.	Administration. (Dept. Chairmen)	Divisional Dean. One year.	Clear line of accountability.	Recently Dept. Chairpersons were made part of the bargaining unit. On the other hand they are not part of the bargaining unit of the Faculty Association.	---- (Note: Divisions are administered by Deans.)
New Jersey (II)	Assoc. Dean	President.	Dean and President. One year.	Greater accountability.	None.	Present system: For reason given.
New York (I)	Dean of Academic Services.	Nomination by the department; Selection by the President.	President. Three years.	Accountability to President.	Confusion as to where they are; faculty or administrators.	Hired directly by the administration as the Chairperson: Loyalty to the administration.
New York (II)	Provost.	Chiefly by selection in consultation w/ the faculty. In 1 area they are elected.	Dean Three years.	It works.	- - -	Administrative selection: It places administrative responsibility with the administration.

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN: SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (1979)

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: Term	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS: BECAUSE:
New York (III)	Vice.Pres. for Faculty and Acad. Affairs.	Three names are selected by the faculty; one is appointed by the Board of Trustees.	Division Deans and Faculty. One year, renewable.	Strongest individuals are selected; are quickly replaced if not successful.	Conflict with evaluation system. Dept. Chrm. evaluate faculty.	The one we have: Problems are minimal. (Note: Deans head Divisions.)
New York (IV)	Dean for Academic Affairs.	Administration.	President. At pleasure of...	None.	None.	Present system as good as any: Any system brings out gripes as well as praise.
No. Carolina (I)	Asst. to the Pres.	Advertising and application. Screening by Dept. committee, Divisional V.P.; Exec. V.P. and President.	Vice-Pres. Undefined.	Dept. heads are part of administrative staff. Positions are permanent so long as performance is up to standard.	Difficulty in locating persons with administrative ability and subject expertise.	--- (Note: Dept. Head is first line administration; Program Directors report to them.)
No. Carolina (II)	Executive Vice. Pres.	Administration.	Vice-Pres. Indefinite.	We consider them as line administrators.		---
Ohio (I)	Dean of Instruction.	Screening Comm.; final choice by Dean; Final decision by Trustees.	Dean of Instruction. Permanent.	Effectiveness; accountability of chairpersons. Seems to work extremely well. More effective in evaluation of faculty.	They do not teach and faculty sometimes feel they are not so well represented.	Present system: Experience has shown (in our situation) that this approach works very well. Strong in administration, faculty evaluation, and initiating change.
Ohio (II)	Dean of Instruction	Div. Directors chosen by Dean of Instruction	Dean of Instruction. Indefinite.	Director needs to become an administrator.	Directors coming from a fac. orientation may not be able to make transit. to administration.	---

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN: SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (1979)

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: Term	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS: BECAUSE:
Oklahoma (I)	Academic Vice. Pres.	Screening committee recommends to Acad. V.P. and Pres., who recommend to Board of Regents for appointment.	Acad. V.P. Indefinite.	a)They owe no allegiance to any faculty members; and b)All components of the college have input.	None.	Present system: Has been developed through a period of years, through an evaluation process. Input from all college components is important.
Oklahoma (II)	Dean of Instruction	Administration.	Dean of Instruction Indefinite.	Being able to select the most qualified person.	Person may not be the faculty's choice.	Chosen by administration: More flexibility in selection.
Oregon (I)	Dean of Instruction	Administration.	Assoc. Deans of Instruction No term.	Better administration. More responsible and responsive to owners of the college, i.e., the public thru its elected board.	None	Present system: Real authority can be delegated to real administrators; problems resolved at level closest to where decisions affect people.
Oregon (II)	Acting Dean of Instruc. & Acting Dir. of Trades & Industry Cluster.	Will have lead instructors/coordinators, paid extra to: be secty. to advisory committee; do schedules; budgets; and staff screening.	For lead instructor, person teaches full time; salary based on collective barg. agreement.	Just installing it; major benefit is cost savings.	Lost front line, full time administrator.	Dept. person elected for 3-year period: One year needed for training to function as administrator; benefits pay off in 2nd year; 3rd year person usually likes it or wants change.
Pennsylvania	Dean of Academic Affairs.	Departmental election subject to administrative ratification.	Dean of Academic Affairs. Four years.	Support of departmental faculty; higher morale; faculty involvement in governance.	Mixed loyalties to faculty and administration; not a serious problem here, however.	Election: Provides a check against arbitrary or faulty judgment.

ELECTED/SELECTED DIVISION CHAIRMEN: SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (1979)

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: Term	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS; BECAUSE:
Pennsylvania (II)	Dean of Academic Affairs.	Dean of Acad. Affrs with advisory faculty participation.	Dean of Acad. Affrs. One year, renewable.	Accountability fixed; politics reduced. (Dept. Chrm. are not part of the collective bargaining unit of the faculty.)	Faculty discontent because they do not have control of the process.	Selection with advisory faculty participation.
Pennsylvanis (III)	Vice.Pres. Acad. Services.	President, who receives recommendations from Dept.	Dean. Open.	NOTE: The department chairmen are members of the same collective bargaining unit as are the faculty, and so the situation may be quite different than others. Moreover, the contract with the Faculty Association covers many of the relationships between chairmen, faculty, and the deans.		
So. Carolina	Vice.Pres. for Education.	Deans	Deans. Open.	We can move them into or out of office quickly, depending on their performance.	None.	Present system: Don't get stuck with 'popular' people getting voted in and not being able to perform.
Texas (I)	Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.	The Dean.	Dean. Indefinite.	Supports strict line-staff organization; allows for delegation of responsibility to Chairmen and accountability for faculty.	Chairmen are not trained as chairmen; especially weak in evaluation of personnel.	Present system: There is no question about authority.
Texas (II)	Vice. Pres. of Acad. Affairs.	The administration.	Vice. Pres. of Acad. Affairs. Contractural	Supportive of existing policies and an understanding of the system.	Peer pressure. Everyone wants to wear "white hat."	Present system.

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO: / TERM:	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS: BECAUSE:
Utah	Vice. Pres. for Instr.	Instructional Deans in conjunction w/ Vice. Pres. for Instr. and Pres. w/ some input from faculty.	An Instr. Dean Indefinite	They have close touch with the faculty over a long period of time; become skillful in evaluating prospective faculty members, and understand the function & operation of the college very well.	Very few from an administrative standpoint.	Present system. Reasons stated. (Note: Deans head major Divisions-groupings of instructional activities and report to Vice -Pres. for Instruction.
Washington (1)	Academic Dean	Faculty election. (Div. Chairmen)	Faculty. Div. Chrm. are responsible to Assoc. Dean. No more than 3 years.	Faculty decide who their representatives will be.	1) No direct accountabiiity to Assoc. Deans; 2) Can be recalled by faculty; admin. would have to work through bargaining spokesmn. 3) May not have organizing skills; takes time to train.	Appointed by administration. Accountable; replacable if problem exists, w/ rather short time line.
Washington (2)	Dean of Instr.	Adminstrators; selected by a screening committee & procedures for selecting administrators.	Dean of Instruction. Yearly contract.	Permanent appointment	---	(Present system)
Washington (3)	Dean of Instr.	Dept. Faculty. (Dept. Chairmn.)	Dean of Instr. Three yrs.	Very functional	None	Associate Deans & Department Chairpersons.

COLLEGE	RESPONDENT	DIV/DEPT. CHRM. CHOSEN BY:	ACCOUNTABLE TO:/ TERM:	ADVANTAGES OF OUR SYSTEM ARE:	DISADVANTAGES ARE:	PREFERABLE SYSTEM IS: BECAUSE:
Washington (iv)	Dean of Instr.	Administrative Appt. (Pres.) (Div. Chrm.)	Dean of Instr.	They are truly representative of the administration.	After a year or more they tend to lose faculty identity if they teach no classes.	Appointment. Chairmen must understand the role they play.

Alabama
California (2)
Louisiana
Maryland
Michigan
Mississippi
New Jersey
North Carolina
Texas

48 colleges responded
10 did not respond

11 colleges have some form of election procedure.

1 has a veto procedure.

FEB 1 1980

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36